

---

Hoosier Archives is a periodic listing of the Diplomacy Library of Walter Buchanan, R. R. 3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052, telephone (317) 482-2824; Archives Director, NFFFGEBDD; a Director of The Diplomacy Association; and a member of IFW. Additions to the library are solicited, either through originals or a loan to permit Xeroxing. Reprints of Diplomacy articles are published, although original contributions are solicited. Although the library is private, its use is for postal Diplomacy in general. Anyone desiring a copy at cost of any of the publications listed, which are unavailable elsewhere, should write to the above address. Many original spares are also now available. To subscribe to Hoosier Archives, send one stamped, self-addressed envelope per issue. Trades are also welcomed.

---

### OUT OF THE ARCHIVES

The "article" below is the second installment of "Out of the Archives" longest strategy and tactics reprint series to date, a seven-part series comprising Larry Peery's book, Diplomacy--Introduction to the Strategy and Tactics of Diplomacy. The book is broken down into seven chapters, one for each of the seven major powers in Diplomacy. This issue features Chapter 2 on England.

### DIPLOMACY--INTRODUCTION TO THE STRATEGY & TACTICS OF DIPLOMACY

by Larry Peery

#### Chapter 2: England

It is no surprise to most Diplomacy players that Jared Johnson's limited response survey into victory probabilities showed that England was the most preferred country among players and that it ranked third in his list of probable winners. These findings were borne out by Dave Lebling's more recent GLOCKORIA #5 ratings which shows England holding second place in the victory ratings as of the completion of 1965M (with Turkey remaining in first place). Lebling, in an accompanying article, attributes England's favorable position to such factors as her position on the end of the board, her good potential for building fleets, her easily defendable position, the simplicity of alliance structure potential, etc. Certainly, England is one of the most interesting countries on the board and one which requires a great deal of study.

A. Acquisition of Unoccupied Supply Centers. England is sadly lacking when it comes to obtaining her share of the twelve unoccupied supply centers at the beginning of the game. Norway, her best possibility, requires at least two units, and perhaps three to seize if Russia is attempting to deny it to England (eg. through opening moves of: Flt. St. Pete. s.c.-Gulf, A Mos-St. Pete, Flt. Gulf-Swe, A St. Pete-Norway; which requires England to support herself into Norway in the Fall of 1901 with one of her fleets and either move the second directly into Norway or use it to convoy her Army there. For an excellent illustration of a Russian-English conflict over Scandinavia, see 1966AG in ADAG). Only with Germany's aid can England take Belgium against French forces (unless France allows her to occupy it, obviously) and that immediately launches England into a war with France. Still, England has many advantages that make up for her lack into this area as we shall see.

B. Alliances. I strongly disagree with Mr. Lebling's statement that "England has a simple alliance potential." I suggest that it is among the most complex of any country's since there are at least six alliances open to England in the opening and early mid game.

1. With France Against Germany. This is probably the second strongest alliance England can make and it is beneficial in that it can survive the length of the game if England concentrates on developing as a sea power and if France develops as a land power. Normally, England receives Holland, Denmark, and Kiel as her share of the spoils and France receives Berlin and Munich. A joint Anglo-French attack on Germany usually brings an over-whelming amount of strength onto Germany's western front and since Germany must keep some forces available in case of a Russian attack (or a surprise attack by Italy or Austria through the south), the two powers should have a decisive margin of forces in the battle. The usual Anglo-French attack on Germany will find France using Belgium and Burgundy as bases to seize the Ruhr and then moving into Munich. Meanwhile, England will be using Norway and the North Sea to take Denmark. Once England has forced her way into the Skaggarat or Helgoland Bight and has taken Denmark, and France has Munich, they can attack Kiel and then Holland and Berlin.

2. With Germany Against France. This can also be a good alliance for England except that she will often find her way blocked by Germany during the mid game, particularly if England has moved into Russia. If England is to fight France, it must be a surprise attack and one that quickly gains control of the English Channel or it is likely to degenerate into a stalemate that can only be broken by German occupation of French supply centers; and once Germany has occupied France, she isn't often willing to give up supply centers, particularly to England. In such an alliance, England normally takes Portugal, Brest, Belgium, and perhaps Spain as her share of the spoils. There is no point to England occupying Paris or Marseilles in light of Germany's over-whelming land superiority.

3. With Germany Against Russia. This is probably England's best alliance, particularly if it is combined with an understanding with France that England and France will jointly eliminate Germany during the mid game. Once Norway has fallen in standard opening moves--(Spring 1901) Flt. London-North, Flt. Edinburgh-Norwegian, Army Liverpool-Yorkshire; (Fall 1901) Flt. North-Convoy-Army-Yorkshire-Norway, Army Yorkshire-Norway, Flt. Norwegian-Support-Yorkshire-Norway--England can move to seize control of the Barents and then either Sweden or St. Petersburg as Germany moves eastward to attack Warsaw and Moscow. England should try to occupy Sweden rather than let Germany do it, in exchange for promises of a free German hand in Moscow and Warsaw. Once England has taken Sweden and St. Petersburg, she can ally with France and move to crush Germany (along with Turkish help assuming Turkey has moved into southern Russia) and pick up many supply centers that neither France or Turkey can reach (eg. Kiel, Denmark, etc.). It is definitely to England's advantage to crush Russia, particularly if Russia is a strong player and thus prevent her from building a strong northern sea power, or moving armies into Scandinavia.

4. With Russia (France) Against Germany. This is a fairly obvious alliance and gives England advantages in that she can pick up some supply centers fairly rapidly (eg. Kiel, Denmark, Holland) and gains time to evaluate France's and Russia's potential. Germany cannot withstand a three-way attack by Russia, France and England, but England must be careful in such an alliance that France and Russia do not build fleets with which to attack England but build armies so that they must fight each other.

5. With Turkey Against Russia. A joint attack on Russia by England and Turkey in the form of a 2 flank attack will be difficult unless Germany or Austria aid the attack by applying pressure to Russia's middle front. Normally, such an attack sees Turkey taking Rumania and Sevastapol, Germany occupying Warsaw and Moscow, and England taking Sweden and St. Petersburg. In such an attack, England normally moves her fleet into the Barents and uses it to support an attack from Norway on St. Petersburg. In the South, Turkey moves: (Spring 1901) Army Smyrna-Armenia, Army Constantinople-Bulgaria, Flt. Ankara-Black Sea; (Fall 1901) Army Armenia-Sevastapol, Army Bulgaria-Support-Armenia-Sevastapol; Flt. Ankara-Black Sea; or Turkey can use the Black (if it gets in on the Spring turn) to convoy Armenia to Rumania with support from Bulgaria. After crushing Russia, the English-Turkish alliance is one of the strongest on the board, and is nice because it gives few opportunities for stabs on either side. In fact, the two together in a strong coalition are almost unbeatable. In fighting Russia,

England must be careful to allow herself to build extra armies to occupy or at least defend a line facing Russia's interior (St. Petersburg and Livonia). England's second or third build should be an army that can be convoyed to the continent.

6. With Italy Against France. England's second flanking attack is in conjunction with Italy against France. It is not usually as successful as an attack against Russia but it offers some interesting possibilities, particularly if France is obviously hostile toward England. The weaknesses to such an alliance are: France's superior defensive position (a fleet in Brest and the strong possibility of a second by 1902), Italy's poor offensive position in relation to France, and England's difficulties in taking the Channel. Still, a drive by England and Italy (especially if Germany helps, and Italy isn't fighting Austria) against France has potential. France can be driven out of Brest and Marseilles first and then an attack launched at the interior. England can expect to receive Brest, Portugal and perhaps Spain for her share of the spoils. She should make every attempt to keep Italian fleets out of Iberia in case of an eventual war with Italy.

C. Non-aggression Pacts. England will have to use the non-aggression pact in the beginning game at least once and preferably twice, and can often afford to extend an early game non-aggression pact into the mid or even end game.

1. With France. If she is planning to fight Russia or Germany, England must have a non-aggression pact with France. In fact, England should as a matter of course seek a non-aggression pact with France for at least two years while seeking to take Norway and waiting to see what Russia and Germany are going to do. A non-aggression pact with France, or extended into a full alliance, is England's best policy. The agreement should normally provide for the neutrality of the North Atlantic, Irish Sea and English Channel and exclude the building of fleets by both countries in Brest or Liverpool.

2. With Germany. If England is to fight France (and it is much better for England to attack France than for her to wait until France attacks her--England's offensive position vis-a-vis France is better than her defensive position), she will have to have some agreement with Germany. Normally, an alliance, unless Germany is fighting Russia (in which an alliance is doubly useful, against France and against Russia), or at least a non-aggression pact. This pact should provide for the neutrality of the Helgoland Bight and Skaggecrak.

3. With Russia. If England is faced with the threat of a joint Franco-German attack, she will have to seek a non-aggression pact with Russia; in fact, only an alliance with Russia (or another Second Tier country) can save England from being overwhelmed by a Franco-German attack.

D. Defensive Game. Referring once again to the Tier Concept, England's best course of action is to attempt to divert one or two of the First Tier nations against the remaining First Tier nations even as she attempts to line up Second Tier nations for mid and end game alliances against the remaining First Tier states. Or, in plainer language: England should try to persuade Russia and France (for instance) to join her in an attack on Germany (and thereby divert them from attacking her). While doing this, she should seek long-term alliances with Turkey, Italy, and Austria against Russia and France.

Often, a superior player will prefer to build up one of his neighbors during the beginning game at the expense of more distant neighbors (eg. England might aid France in an attack on Germany) on the theory that she can then move into France when France is occupied in Germany. This course of action is not recommended for a beginning player, particularly if his neighbor is an experienced player.

As I have already noted, England cannot face a three-way attack from Russia, France and Germany, but such an attack is most unlikely since these three nations can hardly begin a game without fighting each other, or being forced to face an attack from another quarter. Still, if such an attack should come, England had better console herself to eventual defeat. Again, as in Austria's case in facing a Russian, Turkish and Italian attack, England can make every attempt to break up the three-way attack, either by subversion within the three or by appealing to the Second Tier states for aid.

More difficult to assess is the outcome of a Russian-German, or Franco-German attack

on England, particularly without knowing the actions of the Second Tier states (eg. will Turkey attack Russia, will Italy attack France?). Usually, England is well suited to a defensive game against a Russian-French attack since her naval forces can be readily deployed to defend her homeland. A German-Russian attack is broader in scope since it can be directed at either Norway or England. Still, the Russian-German attack is not as great a threat to England since almost always French help is needed to present an immediate threat to England's home supply centers. Any defense of England must be based on the English Channel and the North Sea.

In summary, England, in addition to possessing a strong offensive game base, has the best situation for fighting a defensive war.

E. Offensive Game. England rarely plays a defensive game, perhaps because her defensive position is so strong that few of her neighbors will risk attacking her in the beginning game and perhaps because the potential gains are limited to England's own three supply centers.

England has many choices in playing an offensive game. Any one of three countries may be her target and any one of five countries her ally. We have already discussed the advantages and disadvantages of each particular alliance and will confine this area to general statements. England can go in three different directions: north against Russia, south against France, and through the middle against Germany. The two flanking attacks open to England are often preferred since they not only present a less exposed position to enemy attacks but also make better use of England's fleets. Also, at the end of each flank there exists a logical defensive line (St. Petersburg in the north, the Mid-Atlantic in the south) beyond which England can either advance, or hold that position if she wishes. The middle course offers greater gains, but also offers greater risks, particularly in the area and scope of land defense that England must be able to mount. Only a strong land power can hold Germany against determined attack from the south and east (which is why England likes to have French armies at her side).

Perhaps the best course of planning is for England to attack through the north against Russia with German help. Secondly, an attack on France (again with German help, but with increasing Italian assistance). Thirdly, an attack on Germany with either French or Russian help. It is often better for England to leave Germany as her last First Tier state opponent since she can approach from three directions--through Scandinavia, northern Russia, and from the sea.

#### PEERISITIS

Larry Peery's new project deserves another plug. He plans a study into the "diplomatic" as opposed to the tactical area of Diplomacy and proposes to run a seven game-seven man tournament in his new 'zine, Peerisitis, as a data source to discover what makes a Diplomacy player tick. Through the use of a questionnaire (I've seen it and it's very complete, believe me!), Larry intends to do a complete sociological-psychological research project on the personal interactions of Diplomacy players to determine how the John Smythe's get the John Doe's to trust them completely before delivering ye olde stabberro! If you are a good player and would like to participate and cooperate fully in this project, write: Larry Peery, 816 24th St., San Diego, California 92102. If there is enough demand, Larry will start a second seven game-seven man tournament for this very worthwhile project.

#### ARCHIVES LISTING

Due to its present large size, the archives listing will only appear infrequently or when substantial additions have been added to the archives. Since Hoosier Archives #23 was published, no significant additions have been made.

\* \* \* \* \*